



we should
kill jews
and black people



umm...
let's maybe
not do that

"both of
you are wrong"



[imgflip.com](#)

A lot of individuals learning more about their views tend to identify themselves as “centrists”, when uneducated and faced with the binary dichotomy that is progressivism vs conservatism. People identify as centrists for a variety of reasons, but the most common ones (excluding those who simply don’t know enough about what true progressivism is to make a firm position supporting it) are usually either a view that both progressivism and conservatism are equally undesirable (the “two sides of the same coin” position), or that both have reasonable positions and thus ought be synthesized somehow (the “progressive conservative” position). Broadly, these two positions can be referred to as the ‘horseshoe position’ for the former, and the ‘syncretist position’ for the latter.

However, it is in fact the case that both of these positions rest on fundamentally incoherent premises, as well as

usually a misunderstanding on what ‘progressivism’ and ‘conservatism’ even mean.

There tends to be a conflation made among centrists with conservatism as meaning ‘conservationism’ (the mere ‘*conserving*’ of something, ranging typically from status quo conservation to the conservation of the time period that existed some arbitrary amount of time ago) and progressivism as meaning ‘*modernism*’ (a quality or state of being a new idea or concept).

Rewiring the connotations of these words to be solely time-based helps aid conservatives because it just so happens to be that all of human history is filled with numerous examples of slavery, genocides, and the like, therefore making people think all ‘conservatism’ means is something having to do with the conservation of history acts as a smokescreen to hide the inevitable results that arise from conservative ideas, as well as gives them a ‘reasonable’ mask to uneducated people when conservatives tell them that all they’re doing is conserving ‘tradition’, unbeknownst to the uneducated individual that ‘tradition’ as it stands historically has been to genocide and enslave people; ‘tradition’ as it stands is full of bigotry at every corner.

However, properly understood, it remains the case that conservatism in actuality has very little to do with

'conserving' anything at all, and everything possible to do with bigoted values. Conservatism is properly defined as being a political worldview defined by a broad category of ideas either implicitly or explicitly believing that people should be discriminated against because of their race, gender identity, pronouns, sexual identity, or anything else regarding their identity that does not harm others; that some humans based on some aspect of themselves that they were born with or identify as, or some physical, sexual, or personal pleasure they happen to have can be "lesser" humans than other humans whom they would consider "pure", and therefore that these "subhumans" should be persecuted due to their identity being viewed as "lower" than the identity of someone else a given conservative views as "pure". A proper understanding of conservatism makes it a synonym of bigotry, prejudice, and discrimination.

It is from a proper understanding of conservatism that the error of the horseshoe position becomes obvious; it is completely nonsensical to make a claim that conservatism and progressivism are in any way similar or "two sides of the same coin", as progressivism is merely the consistent rejection of conservatism. It is an occasional claim made by "centrists" holding the horseshoe position that progressivism is somehow the discrimination against those who conservatives often view as "pure" as opposed to who they view as "subhuman"; that somehow progressivism is meant to discriminate against heterosexual adult cisgender white

men (the opposite of who conservatives tend to discriminate against), but properly understood it remains the case that any prejudice is conservative. Conservatives as of currently do tend to view non heterosexual adult cisgender white men as subhuman however, so it would certainly be unorthodox to discriminate against them, but still conservative by virtue of being discrimination; ideas of these sort can be referred to as ‘reverse conservatism’.

Ultimately it is important to emphasize that reverse conservatism is *still conservatism*, not progressivism. TERFs, “superstraights” and “LGB without the T” supporters would be examples of conservatives trying to sneak their way into relevance using a “progressive” paint to hide their views, but ultimately still remain conservatives no matter how much cloaking they try to hide behind.

From that understanding, the horseshoe position view applied to conservatism *and* progressivism both somehow being discrimination falls. There remains a fundamental flaw in the logical conclusion of any individual taking the horseshoe position in that their logical conclusion of ‘neither conservatism nor progressivism’ is ultimately fundamentally incoherent.

The reason why can be quickly identified at the first scenario they would be faced with, for example, let’s say somehow an armed group of klansmen manage to

successfully abduct a black woman, and are now in the process of constructing a gallows from which they plan to hang her. The horseshoe “centrist” in this scenario can take one of two actions, and both of them prove it impossible to remain centrist. They can either take an action to stop the racism from happening, making them progressive, or they can do nothing and allow the racist execution to go forth, making them conservative. There exists no middle ground between these two options as well as no sensible way of rejecting both the choice to act or not act on something; either the centrist chooses to stop the racism or they don’t. Both options push the centrist into being either progressive or conservative respectively by the law of the excluded middle.

With the horseshoe position dismantled, the syncretist position can then be examined; the claim that somehow both “conservatives and progressives have good ideas that ought be mixed”. Individuals of this view usually find themselves aligned with the reverse conservatives, typically along the lines of “LGB without the T” individuals, that would, for example, claim to be “only transphobic but not homophobic”. Putting aside that the aspects of conservatism they choose to hold them back from their progressive views are chosen completely arbitrarily, it remains true that in any case adopting any degree of conservatism makes one fall nothing short of being merely inconsistent. It also makes them incapable of claiming their progressive aspects, as

progressivism is not “go halfway with liberation but then be fine with genocide the rest of the way there”.

Applied to the aforementioned scenario, the “progressive conservative” may try to, for example, make a compromise between the conservatives and progressives to have the conservatives release the black woman on the condition that she pays them a ransom, and allow her to be executed if she doesn’t do so. However, taking this compromise would *still be conservative*, as it allows racism to still be permitted if a condition is not met, and requires a sacrifice from the victim of conservatism in order to be liberated from it.

Any “compromise” between conservatism and progressivism **inevitably** works in favor of conservatism, as it allows their bigotry to go forth with progressivism limited in what it can do to stop it. And with each compromise done between the two, conservatism grows as more and more progressives are oppressed at every compromise.

“Centrism” fundamentally because of this reasons can’t possibly exist; it is incoherent and falls due to the law of the excluded middle. Anyone identifying as a centrist can more properly be identified as one of two things, the first being a ‘progressive in-denial’, in which they agree bigotry including statism ultimately should not be permitted, but refuse to label themselves as a progressive due to misconceptions

about what progressivism even means, and the second being crypto-conservatives who believe bigotry should indeed be permitted but use the ‘centrist’ label to mask their views so that they aren’t publicly seen as the conservatives that they are.